



ADDENDUM NO. 1

Project: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANT

Request for Proposals (RFP) for Parking and Traffic Consultant for the Redevelopment of the Ninth and Penn Parking Garage (the "Consultant RFP").

For:

Public Parking Authority of Pittsburgh
232 Boulevard of the Allies
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1616

Date:

January 27, 2017

The previously issued information, in conjunction with the items listed below, are included as part of the Consultant RFP.

Item No. 1:

The sign in sheet attached hereto lists the attendees of the pre-proposal meeting held on January 18, 2017 at 2:00 pm EST.

Item No. 2:

The following questions were presented at the pre-proposal meeting or as part of the Request for Clarification Process:

- 1) Question:** Will the successful respondent be asked to review other documents or just parking and traffic information?

Answer: The successful respondent will be primarily asked to review parking and traffic information and to prepare a parking feasibility study in accordance with the Scope of Work in the Consultant RFP.

- 2) Question:** Is it the Parking and Traffic Consultant's responsibility to review any traffic studies submitted as part of responses to the Request for Proposals for the Redevelopment of the Ninth and Penn Parking Garage (the "Redevelopment RFP")?

Answer: Yes, as it will be the consultant's responsibility to assist the Authority's scoring committee when evaluating the accuracy and efficiency of the parking and traffic information set forth in the proposals and throughout the project.

3) Question: Will the Parking and Traffic Consultant be required to prepare traffic studies if a Phase goes in that direction or if a need is apparent?

Answer: It is not anticipated that a separate traffic study on behalf of the Authority will be required as part of the process described in the Redevelopment RFP; however, the Authority reserves the right to request such a study.

4) Question: Should respondents take in to account the bike lanes and usage?

Answer: It is assumed that this question is posed in the context of preparation of a parking feasibility analysis. In that instance, bike lanes and usage should be considered to the extent it may impact parking demand.

5) Question: Is there going to be involvement with the Department of Public Works?

Answer: Potentially.

6) Question: How many parking spots would the Authority require in the new development?

Answer: A minimum of 700 public parking spaces.

7) Question: What are the options being looked at for the redevelopment of Ninth & Penn Garage? Does the Cultural Trust own or run the land or property?

Answer: Other than being the owner of the parcels surrounding the garage, the Cultural Trust has no involvement with the Authority. See the Redevelopment RFP that was attached to the Consultant RFP for additional guidance. Beyond a 700-space public parking garage, it is difficult for the Authority to predict what types of projects will be proposed in response to the Redevelopment RFP and the Cultural Trust's participation therein.

8) Question: Are exhibits and resumes excluded from the 20-page limit required for submitted proposals?

Answer: Yes.

9) Question: For response to the requested Item 6.D Fee Proposal in the RFP, will the Parking Authority consider it acceptable and responsive for proposers to provide a full hourly fee for each staff category (e.g., Senior Engineer; Engineer; Designer; etc.) that may be required to perform the required services?

Answer: Yes, the Authority will accept hourly rates for differently designated professional levels.

10) Question: If the answer to question 9, above is yes, will it be appropriate to identify the staff categories and associated full hourly fees for each of the main Phases identified in the RFP. Namely Phase 1, Phase 2 Alternate A, and Phase 2 Alternate B; OR, is it required to identify the staff categories and associated full hourly fees for each bullet point under the three main Phases?

Answer: Respondents should provide pricing based on Phases and Alternates and need not necessarily provide an hourly rate with respect to each bullet point.

11) Question: Will firms with local presence be scored more favorably?

Answer: The scoring will be based on the "scoring parameters" outlined in the RFP.

12) Question: The scope is fairly open ended - do you envision this more as a task order or an on-call?

Answer: The Authority considers this a "task order" contract inasmuch as the Authority will request certain services from the consultant as the project proceeds and will be expected to be billed hourly by the consultant for the performance of such work.

Item No. 1
(Sign in Sheet)

SIGN IN SHEET

Pre-Proposal meeting for Redevelopment of the Ninth & Penn Parking Garage (Parking & Traffic Consultant)

THE INFORMATION AND CONTACTS LISTED WILL BECOME THE INFORMATION USED FOR FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE

Date: JANUARY 18, 2017

Time: 2:00 pm EST

PLEASE PRINT INFORMATION CLEARLY & COMPLETELY

#	COMPANY NAME & COMPANY ADDRESS	CONTACT PERSONS NAME & TITLE	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER
1	PERMONT 750 HERRICK DR Bldg 9 - Ste 700 PITTSBURGH, PA 15222	ANTHONY CASTELLONE TRANSPORTATION DIVISION MGR	acastellone@permonv.com	412.229.2794 724.554.7739(C)
2	John J. Clark & Associates, Inc (MBE) 16 Niagara Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15221	John Clark President	clarkservices.net@gmail.com	412-973-9285
3	James Parsons Brinkerhoff WSP PERSONS BRINKERHOFF FOUR CANTERBURY CENTER #1305 PITTSBURGH PA 15222	THOMAS LAMES Sr. Surveying Supt.	tlames@pbworld.com	412 644 3033 office 412 580 6423 cell
4	Scott Hissong WSP/ Parsons Brinkerhoff Four Canterbury Center, Suite 1305 Pgh PA 15222	Scott Hissong Lead Engineer	hissongsm@pbworld.com	412 644 3064

PLEASE PRINT INFORMATION CLEARLY & COMPLETELY

#	COMPANY NAME & COMPANY ADDRESS	CONTACT PERSONS NAME & TITLE	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER
5	Rick Klein Walker Parking Consultants 525 Ave Dr, Ste 1 Ann Arbor MI 48108	Rick Klein Managing Director	rick.klein@walkerparking.com	734 663 1070
6				
7				
8				
9				